

David C. Wakefield, Esq. Bar #: 185736
Lightning Law, APC
10620 Treena Street, Suite 230
San Diego, CA 92131
Telephone: 619.485.4300; Facsimile: 619.342.7755
E-mail: dcw@DMWakeLaw.com; wakefieldlawassistant@gmail.com
Attorney for Plaintiffs

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**UNITED AFRICAN-ASIAN
ABILITIES CLUB, ON BEHALF
OF ITSELF AND ITS
MEMBERS; JAMES LEE, An
Individual**

Plaintiffs,

v.

**RESEDA ASSOCIATES 888
LLC; AND DOES 1 THROUGH
10, Inclusive**

Defendants.

Case No:

COMPLAINT

**DISCRIMINATORY
PRACTICES**

**[US Fair Housing Act of 1988 [42
U.S.C. §§ 3600 et seq, §3604(c),
§3604(f)(1-3), et seq.; CA
Government Code 12925, 12927,
12955; CA Civil Code §§ 51, 52,
54.3**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiffs make the following allegations in this civil rights action:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. The federal jurisdiction of this action is based on the 42 U.S.C. §§ 3601, 3604 et. seq. - the U.S. Fair Housing Act Amendments of 1988 (Defendants' apartment property consist of four (4) or more residential units), and 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et. seq., the federal Americans With Disabilities Act. Venue is proper in this United States District Court for the Central District of California pursuant to 28

1 U.S.C. § 1391(b), because a substantial part of Plaintiffs' claims arose within said
2 Judicial District.

3 **SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION**

4 3. This United States District Court for the Central District of California has
5 supplemental jurisdiction over the California state claims as alleged in this
6 Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

7 **NAMED DEFENDANTS AND NAMED PLAINTIFFS**

8 4. The term Plaintiffs as used herein specifically include the corporate Plaintiff
9 entity known as the United African-Asian Abilities Club, On Behalf Of Itself And Its
10 Members (hereinafter referred to as "Club" or "UAAAC"); and the individual
11 Plaintiff JAMES LEE (hereinafter referred to as "LEE" or the "named Individual
12 Plaintiff". The Plaintiff Club and Plaintiff LEE are sometimes collectively referred
13 to as the "named Plaintiffs" or "Plaintiffs".

14 5. Plaintiff United African-Asian Abilities Club (UAAAC) is registered and in
15 good standing as a Nevada corporation. The named individual Plaintiff LEE is a
16 member of the Plaintiff Club organization.

17 6. Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon allege that named Defendant
18 RESEDA ASSOCIATES 888 LLC is the operator of the apartment rental business
19 known as Victoria Apartments located at 7817 Reseda Blvd Reseda, CA 91335.
20 Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon allege that Defendant RESEDA
21 ASSOCIATES 888 LLC is the owner, operator, and/or lessor of the real property
22 located at 7817 Reseda Blvd Reseda, CA 91335 (hereinafter referred to as the
23 "Property").

24 7. Defendant RESEDA ASSOCIATES 888 LLC is, and at all times mentioned
25 herein were, a business or corporation or franchise, organized and existing and/or
26 doing business under the laws of the State of California. Defendants Does 1 through
27
28

1 10, were at all times relevant herein subsidiaries, employers, employees, and/or
2 agents of the named Defendants.

3 **CONCISE SET OF FACTS**

4 8. The named Individual Plaintiff Lee has hip and knee conditions, uses a device
5 for mobility, is unable to walk any distance, and also has a vision disability. Plaintiff
6 Lee is also a member of the Plaintiff Club. The individual Plaintiff Lee had specific
7 dates wherein he intended to go the Defendant's Property to access Defendants'
8 rental services. Plaintiff Lee has actual knowledge of the overt and obvious physical
9 and communication barriers at Defendants' Property. Plaintiff Lee determined that
10 the open and obvious physical barriers that exist at Defendants' Property directly
11 related to his disabilities, and that it would be impossible or extremely difficult for
12 him to physically access Defendants' on-site rental services. See ¶¶ 25. Plaintiff
13 Lee had knowledge of access barriers at the Property and determined that it would be
14 futile gesture for him to go to the Property on the date that he had intended. The
15 named Individual Plaintiff Lee was deterred by his actual knowledge of the physical
16 and communication barriers that exist at Defendants' Property and also Defendants'
17 website communication barriers. As used herein, website means any internet website
18 where Defendants control the content. Exhibit B states the websites controlled by
19 Defendants. Plaintiff Lee also attempted to access Defendants' rental services on
20 Defendants websites but experienced great difficulty due to Defendants' failure to
21 provide accessible website features.

22 9. The named Individual Plaintiff Lee attempted to use Defendants' website to
23 access Defendants' online rental services, but had great difficulty due to his
24 disabilities. The named Individual Plaintiff Lee also could not determine from
25 Defendants' website content whether Defendants' rental services at the property or
26 off the property, and common areas at the property were physically accessible to
27
28

1 him. The named Individual Plaintiff Lee requested that Plaintiff Club assist him to
2 obtain information regarding the physical accessibility of Defendants' on-site office
3 where Defendants' offer its rental services. In response to the named Individual
4 Plaintiff's request, Plaintiff Club sent one of its members to Defendants' physical on-
5 site office. The named Individual Plaintiff personally reviewed all the information
6 and photographs of Defendants' property. As a result, the named Individual Plaintiff
7 has actual knowledge of the overt and obvious physical and communication barriers
8 at Defendants' Property. The named Individual Plaintiff determined that the open
9 and obvious physical barriers that exist at Defendants' Property directly related to his
10 disabilities, and that it would be impossible or extremely difficult for him to
11 physically access Defendants' on-site rental services. See ¶¶ 25. The named
12 Individual Plaintiff Lee had actual knowledge and determined that it would be futile
13 gesture for him to go to the Property on the date that he had intended. The named
14 Individual Plaintiff was deterred by his actual knowledge of the physical and
15 communication barriers that exist at Defendants' Property and website. The named
16 Individual Plaintiff made a written request to Defendants' for an accommodation to
17 have equal access to Defendants' rental services and to eliminate the communication
18 and physical barriers to Defendants' rental services, both online and at the property.
19 At the end of this action, the named Individual Plaintiff Lee intends to return to
20 Defendants' website and physical office on or off the property location to obtain
21 rental information and verify that the communication and physical barriers to
22 Defendants' rental services are removed.

23
24 10. The named Plaintiff Club is an organization that advocates on the behalf of its
25 members with disabilities when their civil rights and liberties have been violated.
26 Plaintiff Club and Plaintiff Lee investigated Defendants' websites and apartment
27 Property in June, 2022, and in July, 2022. The named Plaintiffs investigated
28

1 Defendants apartment property and Defendants websites. Plaintiff Club member
2 Sharon Riguer investigated the Property on the Internet websites. Additional
3 Plaintiff Club members investigated Defendants websites and found that they did not
4 provide equal access. The results of the research from Club Member Sharon Riguer
5 are contained in the Exhibit B to this Complaint. Club members ascertained that
6 Defendants' rental services at Defendants Property were not physically accessible to
7 Plaintiff Lee by a Club member with a disability who went to Defendants' apartment
8 Property, and said Club member attempted to access Defendants' on-site rental
9 services.

10 11. Plaintiff Club diverted its time and resources from its normal purposes
11 because of Defendants' service, policy, program and physical barriers to Defendants
12 rental services at Defendants' websites and Property. Club personnel conducted
13 detailed Internet searches to determine if Defendants provide large print, deaf
14 interpreter, therapy animal, the required reasonable accommodation policy, and
15 required reasonable modification policy. Further, the Club retained contractors to
16 investigate said policies, to survey the property, to photograph the property, to
17 investigate when the Property was constructed, to investigate the Property ownership
18 and to have an access report prepared. Plaintiff Club also diverted staff to
19 investigate Defendants' Internet presence to determine compliance with the FHA and
20 ADA. Plaintiff Club also investigated Defendants' written rental materials such as
21 brochures, rental applications and leases. Moreover, Plaintiff Club made an oral
22 investigation to ascertain Defendants' companion animal, deaf interpreter and
23 reasonable accommodation and reasonable modification policies. Plaintiff Club also
24 caused a physical access consultant to be retained to survey Defendants' facility.
25 Plaintiff Club's findings regarding Defendants' rental services and facilities were
26 incorporated into an Access Report. The Access Report also details the known overt
27
28

1 and obvious physical access violations at the Property, but it is not intended as an
2 exhaustive list of existing violations. Due to these necessary activities to investigate,
3 Plaintiff Club's time and resources were diverted from its normal activity. Plaintiff
4 Club suffered injury and also suffered monetary damages due to the diversion of the
5 Club's resources from its normal purposes.

6 12. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants control, operate, and maintain web pages at
7 different apartment websites where Defendants offer its rental services.

8 Additionally, Defendants have a physical office location at the Property where they
9 also offer their rental services.

10 13. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' websites have a close nexus to Defendants'
11 physical site rental services because the websites refer to Defendants' rental services
12 that are offered at Defendants' actual physical office on or off the site. Therefore,
13 Plaintiffs allege that the websites are also places of public accommodation.

14 Defendants control the websites to the extent that Defendants can change the website
15 content to make modifications to comply with the FHA and ADA. Therefore,
16 Plaintiffs allege that Defendants can modify the content of Defendants' websites to
17 improve access for Plaintiffs and people with disabilities.

18 14. In this case, the named Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants failed to provide a
19 TTY number or the text messaging system for Plaintiffs and other people that are
20 deaf or people with speech conditions. Plaintiff Club members have a speech
21 disability. Moreover, Plaintiff Club alleges that the Defendants did not modify their
22 websites to eliminate non-readable text to allow the blind and people with low vision
23 to use the screen reader software to access the information on the website, yet they
24 also failed to use large print on their websites. See Exhibit B to this Complaint.
25 Plaintiffs assert that most popular screen reader programs are called Jobs Access
26 With Speech or "JAWS" and Apple's VoiceOver Software. Defendants actions
27
28

1 discriminate against Plaintiff Club, specifically Club members who have low vision
2 disabilities. Each of the Club members above cannot use the websites controlled by
3 the Defendants. Modifications to Defendants' websites will not fundamentally alter
4 the rental services provided and will also not cause an undue burden to Defendants,
5 because the cost is less than One Thousand Dollars (\$1,000).

6 15. On June 12, 2022, and June 26, 2022, Plaintiff Club attempted to make a
7 request to the Defendants for reasonable accommodation at the property. On July
8 23, 2022, the named individual Plaintiff LEE and Plaintiff Club emailed to the
9 Defendants a written request for a reasonable accommodation. In July, 2022,
10 Plaintiff LEE and Plaintiff Club, mailed a written request for a reasonable
11 accommodation. Defendants failed to respond to both Plaintiffs requests for
12 reasonable accommodation as of the date of the filing of this Civil Complaint.

13 16. Plaintiffs are not able to access Defendants rental services due to existing
14 overt and obvious communication and physical barriers to access Defendants' rental
15 services both at its online website and at the physical office. Due to the overt and
16 obvious physical barriers as alleged herein below, which are required to be removed,
17 Plaintiffs requested that Defendants accommodate them to provide access to
18 Defendants' rental services.

19 17. The named Plaintiffs allege that an accommodation is also obvious when a
20 whole group of the protected persons requires it. For example, when the public
21 without disabilities are required to get up to a second level, the public would be very
22 disturbed if they were required to request steps to go up to second level. When the
23 accommodation is specific to a particular person with a disability, then that person
24 may be required to make a request, because the accommodation is not obvious.

25 18. Plaintiffs allege that they are not required to make a request for reasonable
26 accommodation and for auxiliary aids when the barriers to communication are overt
27
28

1 and obvious. However, in the present case, Plaintiffs did make such requests for
2 accommodation to eliminate overt and obvious barriers to its rental services
3 communications. Plaintiffs allege that providing effective contact information for
4 Defendants' rental services on the internet is an obvious accommodation. The
5 general public does not need to request a contact number from the Defendant
6 apartment owner or operator when they desire to rent a place. Defendants provide the
7 contact number on their website. Therefore, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants are
8 required to provide the obvious accommodation of effective communication for
9 people that are deaf or with speech impediment on their website without a request.
10 Defendants must make their rental services accessible without the need for a prior
11 request. Furthermore, Defendants have a duty to remove architectural barriers and
12 communication barriers to their rental services without request.

13 19. Plaintiffs allege that there is disparate treatment on the internet related to the
14 amenities being offered to people without disabilities and people with disabilities.
15 All the below facts and the facts stated elsewhere herein have a disparate impact on
16 the disability community. The named Plaintiffs experienced and have knowledge of
17 the below facts that the Plaintiffs ascertained from Defendants' websites. Defendant
18 operates an apartment property. The property is located at 7817 Reseda Blvd,
19 Reseda, CA 91335. The property was built in 1964 and has 3 stories with 35 units.
20 The rent is approximately: \$1500 to \$2000. The internet provides a wealth of
21 information regarding the property. The internet advertises that the property has
22 amenities that include: Community Amenities: Laundry Facilities, Recycling, Pool;
23 Apartment Features: High Speed Internet Access, Air Conditioning, Smoke Free,
24 Cable Ready, Oven, Range, Balcony; Pet Policies (No Pets Allowed); Parking:
25 Surface Lot: 1 space, Assigned Parking; Covered: Unassigned Parking, Parking
26 Available; Utilities Included: Gas, Water. The property advertises on
27
28

1 apartmentguide.com, rent.com, redfin.com, apartmenthomeliving.com,
2 westsiderentals.com, rentals.com. It is very important to know that on
3 apartmentguide.com, rent.com, redfin.com, apartmenthomeliving.com,
4 westsiderentals.com, rentals.com there is the equal housing opportunity logo. The
5 plaintiff alleges that there is disparate treatment on the internet related to the
6 amenities being offered to people without disabilities and people with disabilities.
7 For example, the tow signage was not installed. The accessible parking space had an
8 access aisle, which was not van accessible. The aisle did not have the “no parking”
9 included in the access aisle. The office had a high threshold. There was no
10 International Symbol of Accessibility signage. The Internet does not state the
11 accessible amenities at all. Also, the statement the “equal housing opportunity
12 statement” is misleading. In fact, the property is not completely accessible. All the
13 above facts and the facts stated herein have a disparate impact on the disability
14 community.

15 20. On Defendants’ websites, they allow the public without deafness and without
16 speech impairments to participate by providing them with a telephone number to
17 call. However, Plaintiff Club members that are deaf and or with speech impairments
18 are denied equal access to participate because the Defendants do not have any
19 effective communication.

20 21. Defendants provide websites for people without disabilities to benefit from the
21 rental services without going to the apartments to learn about the properties.
22 However, for people with disabilities that require the access to the facility, the
23 Defendants do not provide any information on the websites regarding if the office on
24 or off the site is accessible. Moreover, the Defendants provide the telephone number
25 for the public to call to inquire about the rental services without providing any
26 effective alternative communications for Plaintiffs and other people that are deaf or
27

1 have speech impairments.

2 22. For people without disabilities, the Defendants provide all of the information
3 on their websites. For Plaintiffs with disabilities, Defendants require them to travel to
4 the Property to determine if it is accessible, then require them to request the effective
5 communication, and then thereafter to request a reasonable accommodation to the
6 overt and obvious communication barrier. Therefore, Defendants require Plaintiffs
7 and other people with disabilities to suffer a separate benefit.

8 23. Additionally, the named Plaintiffs are alleging photograph discrimination
9 related to the physical access of each of the apartments within Exhibit B to this
10 complaint. The purpose of Defendants' internet photographs is to entice perspective
11 renters to apply online or to contact the Defendants to rent a place. Defendants'
12 internet photographs only entice people without mobility disabilities. Defendants'
13 internet photographs exclude any photographs of any accessible features that would
14 aid the Plaintiffs. For example, there is no photograph of accessible parking. There
15 are no photographs of the accessible route to the office on or off the site. There are
16 photographs of the accessible route to the manager's office. There are no photographs
17 related to the access to get into and use the rental or manager's office. There are no
18 photographs related to the accessible route of the common area. There are no
19 photographs of the accessible units. In fact, all the photographs lead a person with a
20 mobility disability to believe that the apartments are not accessible, or that they must
21 have someone go to the properties to make sure it is accessible. However, people
22 without disabilities are not required to go to the Property to see if it is accessible.

23 24. Defendants websites and Defendants' rental services are not integrated for
24 people with disabilities as required. Plaintiffs are required to request an
25 accommodation. People without disabilities can access the websites and the rental
26 services without any problem, but Plaintiffs and other people with disabilities are
27
28

1 required to request for separate rental services. People with mobility conditions are
2 not integrated when using the websites because they must go to the apartments to
3 determine if they are accessible, but people without disabilities need only access
4 Defendants' websites to determine they can use them. People that are blind and with
5 low vision disabilities must request help to read the website information because the
6 printed information is too small, but people without disabilities can access the
7 websites without asking for help. Plaintiffs and other people with deafness or people
8 with speech condition must ask for help calling the number on the websites, because
9 Defendants fail to provide a TTY number to contact, or Defendants fail to provide a
10 texting system. Defendants discriminated against the Plaintiffs.

11 25. Plaintiff Club member went to Defendant's apartment facilities at the Property
12 twice in June, 2022, to access the rental services. The Named Individual Plaintiff
13 has actual knowledge of Defendants' overt and obvious physical barriers, that relate
14 to this Plaintiff's disabilities, to Defendants' Property on-site rental services that this
15 Named Individual Plaintiff intended to visit twice in June, 2022, but this Plaintiff
16 was deterred from accessing Defendant's rental services located on the Property.
17 Defendants provide rental information, rental applications, and other rental services
18 on-site at the Property. Defendants' agents confirmed to the Plaintiffs that rental
19 information, rental applications, and other rental services were available on-site at
20 the Property. Defendants' rental services at the Property are not accessible.
21 Defendants' path of travel from the sidewalk to the rental services is not accessible
22 since it has excessive slopes without handrails and step changes in level along the
23 path. There is an excessive slope without handrails that must be traversed to access
24 the main gated entrance door leading into the complex. The main gated entrance
25 door fails to have the required smooth and uninterrupted surface at the bottom of the
26 door. The main gated entrance door is not accessible due to a significant step change
27 in level at the entrance door threshold that is not beveled or ramped. Defendant's
28

1 callbox is located too high to be accessible. Defendants do not provide the required
2 directional signage as to the designated path of travel from the sidewalk to
3 Defendant's rental services. Defendant's rental services gated entrance door fails to
4 have the required smooth and uninterrupted surface at the bottom of the door.
5 Defendant's rental services gated entrance door is not accessible due to a significant
6 step change in level at the rental services door threshold that is not beveled or
7 ramped. Additionally, Defendant's rental services gated entry door operating
8 hardware is a round knob. The Named Individual Plaintiff has mobility disabilities
9 and these step changes in level, excessive slopes, and the other stated issues cause
10 the path of travel and the rental services entry to be not accessible. Defendants failed
11 to provide any directional signage indicating an alternate accessible path of travel to
12 the rental services. Defendants failed to provide the required fully compliant van
13 accessible disabled parking for the rental services. Defendants failed to provide a
14 dimensionally compliant van accessible disabled parking space and disabled parking
15 access aisle, the required disabled parking signage, including tow away signage, fine
16 signage, ground markings, and failed to locate said parking on a level surface and
17 nearest the rental services. Defendants also failed to provide compliant tow away
18 signage. The Named Individual Plaintiff requires the use of a compliant van
19 accessible disabled parking space to safely exit and re-enter the vehicle.
20 Defendants' failure to provide the required compliant disabled parking, disabled
21 parking access aisle, disabled parking disability signage, access aisle, and disability
22 ground markings, such that the Named Individual Plaintiff is not able to safely park
23 at Defendants' establishment since the individual Plaintiff may be precluded from
24 exiting or re-entering the vehicle if the disabled parking and disabled parking
25 signage is not present and others park improperly. Additionally, Defendants failed to
26 provide the required accessible path of travel from the parking area to the rental
27 services since the existing path of travel has step changes in level and slopes that
28

1 exceed the maximum permitted. Additionally, Defendants overt and obvious
2 communication barriers were also present at the rental services twice in June, 2022.
3 Defendants failed to provide any method of text communication with their rental
4 services and failed to publish any information as to how to initiate text
5 communication contact. The Named Individual Plaintiff had actual knowledge of
6 these barriers at Defendants' Property that Plaintiff intended to visit, and the Named
7 Individual Plaintiff was deterred from accessing Defendants' rental services at the
8 Property again in July, 2022. Exhibit C contains photographs taken by the Plaintiffs
9 at the property. See also Exhibit B.

10 26. Plaintiff Club and the named Individual Plaintiff desire to make sure that
11 Defendants' rental services at Defendants' physical office location and Defendants'
12 websites are fully accessible to Plaintiff Club's members, the named Individual
13 Plaintiff, and other people with disabilities. Plaintiff Club, its Club members, and the
14 named Individual Plaintiff all have actual knowledge of Defendants' discriminatory
15 conditions, and they are currently deterred from attempting further access until the
16 barriers are removed. Plaintiff Club and the named Individual Plaintiff intend to
17 return to Defendants' Property and Defendants websites at the end of this action to
18 obtain rental services, and to verify that the communication and architectural barriers
19 are removed. The named Plaintiffs' intent to return is genuine. In this case, Plaintiff
20 Club has numerous members residing near Defendants Property. Plaintiff Club's
21 members have actual knowledge of the discriminatory conditions as alleged herein
22 when the Plaintiff Club investigated the Property and the rental services and
23 determined that the Club members would not be able to use the rental services due to
24 the discriminatory conditions. Therefore, Plaintiff Club members were and are
25 deterred from visiting the properties. Plaintiff Members were not required to
26 actually visit the properties. See *Civil Rights Education & Enforcement Center v.*
27
28

1 *Hospitality Properties Trust*, 867 F.3d 1093 (9th Cir. 2017). However, a member of
 2 Plaintiff Cub did visit and attempt to access Defendants' rental services at
 3 Defendants' physical office at the Property. Plaintiff Club and the individual
 4 Plaintiff have specific plans to visit at the conclusion of this case to obtain rental
 5 information and to verify the Defendants ceased its discriminatory conduct by
 6 removing communication and physical barriers to access to the rental services.
 7

8
 9 **DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES IN HOUSING ACCOMMODATIONS –**
 10 **FAIR HOUSING ACT CLAIMS**

11 27. FHA Standing:

12 Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere herein this
 13 complaint, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiffs in violation of FHA sections §
 14 3604(f)(1- 3) and 42 § 3604(c), as further detailed below. As a result, the present
 15 named Plaintiffs suffered injury as a result of Defendants discriminatory actions, and
 16 named Plaintiffs now pray for damages, injunctive relief, declaratory relief, and
 17 other relief as hereinafter stated. The Federal Fair Housing Act applies to
 18 Defendants' apartment complex since it has more than 4 residential units. FHA
 19 standing is substantially broader than standing under the ADA due to the critically
 20 important need of adequate availability of housing for the disabled. A potential
 21 plaintiff is not even required to have an interest in renting a particular property or
 22 dwelling to have standing. *Smith v. Pacific Properties and Development Corp*, 358
 23 F.3d 1097, 1099 (9th Cir 2004) [Testers have standing to bring Fair Housing Act
 24 claims, *Id* 1099, 1104]. Under the Act, any person harmed by discrimination,
 25 whether or not the target of the discrimination, can sue to recover for his or her own
 26 injury. *See Trafficante v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.*, 409 U.S. 205, 212, 93 S.Ct. 364,
 27 34 L.Ed.2d 415 (1972). "This is true, for example, even where no housing has
 28 actually been denied to persons protected under the Act." *San Pedro Hotel v City of*

1 *Los Angeles*, 159 F.3d 470, 474-475 (9th Cir 1998). In the present case, the named
 2 Plaintiffs alleged they suffered the injury of discriminatory conduct by Defendants,
 3 and that the named Plaintiffs suffered monetary and other damages as a result. The
 4 named Plaintiffs seek injunctive relief as well as damages, both of which are
 5 available under 42 USC § 3613(c). Assuming *arguendo* in the present case, that
 6 prospective injunctive relief was not available to Plaintiffs due to mootness or
 7 otherwise, which Plaintiffs dispute; the named Plaintiffs are still permitted to recover
 8 damages under their federal FHA claims. *Harris v Itzakhi*, 183 F.3d 1043, 1050 (9th
 9 Cir 1999) [During the appeal in *Harris* case, the plaintiff therein moved Three
 10 Thousand (3000) miles away and her injunctive claims became moot. However,
 11 Plaintiff's claim for damages survived and was not affected]. In the present case,
 12 while Plaintiffs can satisfy the injunctive relief prudential standing requirements, the
 13 above Ninth Circuit *Harris* court authority makes it clear that those prudential
 14 standing requirements for injunctive relief are not applicable to Plaintiffs FHA
 15 damage claims. Hence, in the present case, Plaintiffs damage claims survive even if
 16 prospective injunctive relief is not available. The present Plaintiff Club has
 17 organization standing separately on its own under the FHA. Additionally, under the
 18 FHA, Plaintiff Club has associational standing to assert its Club member claims
 19 since it only seeks injunctive and declaratory relief as to its Club members. Plaintiff
 20 Club and the named Individual Plaintiff have standing with respect to the following
 21 FHA claims.

22
 23 CLAIM I: Discrimination In Violation of 42 § 3604(f)(1) - Failure To Have A
 24 Policy For Receiving Prospective Tenant Accommodation Requests, Failure To
 25 Train Staff, And Failure To Make The Policy Known To The Plaintiffs

26 28. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere herein this
 27 complaint, the named Plaintiffs suffered discrimination by Defendants in violation of
 28

1 this FHA section. This FHA statute states it is unlawful to discriminate in the sale or
 2 rental, or to otherwise make unavailable or deny, a dwelling to any buyer or renter
 3 because of a handicap of (A) that buyer or renter; (B) a person residing in or
 4 intending to reside in that dwelling after it is so sold, rented, or made available; or...
 5 §3604(f)(1) [emphasis added]. See *Texas Dept. of Housing and Community Affairs*
 6 *v Inclusive Communities Project*, 135 S.Ct. 2507, 2519 (2015) [FHA statutory
 7 scheme permits disparate impact claims, and those type of claims do not require
 8 intent]. due to Defendants' communication and architectural barriers, Defendants
 9 discriminated against Plaintiffs by failing to have a policy, practice, or method for
 10 Plaintiffs to make a reasonable accommodation request for equal access to their
 11 rental services on their website or at their on-site office at the Property. Defendants
 12 have an affirmative duty to have a policy, process to receive such accommodation
 13 requests and to respond to said requests. See *Giebelier v. M & B Associates*, 343 F.3d
 14 1143 (9th Cir. 2003). As a result, Defendant caused Plaintiffs to suffer disparate
 15 impact discrimination.
 16

17 CLAIM II: Failure to Engage in Interactive Process In Violation Of The Fair
 18 Housing Act And California Fair Employment And Housing Act

19 29. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere herein this
 20 complaint, Plaintiffs suffered discrimination by Defendants in violation of FHA
 21 section § 3604(f)(1) and § 3604(f)(2). Plaintiffs contend that Defendant failed to
 22 engage in a good-faith interactive process to determine and to implement effective
 23 reasonable accommodations so that Plaintiffs could gain equal access Defendants'
 24 rental services, to apply for a lease, or to allow Plaintiffs to access Defendants'
 25 physical office on or off the site and apartments.
 26

27 CLAIM III: Discrimination In Violation of 42 § 3604(f)(2)

28 30. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere herein this

1 complaint, the named Plaintiffs suffered discrimination by Defendants in violation of
2 this FHA section § 3604(f)(2). This FHA section states “it shall be unlawful to
3 discriminate against any person in the terms, conditions, or privileges of sale or
4 rental of a dwelling, or in the provision of services or facilities in connection with
5 such dwelling”. Plaintiffs more specific factual basis for this claim is set forth
6 above at ¶¶23-26 above. As previously stated, the named Individual Plaintiff was a
7 prospective renter and Plaintiff Club was also seeking rental housing on behalf of the
8 named Individual Plaintiff ¶¶8 – 26 above. In the instant case, Defendant’s office
9 located on the Property is a “facility” in connection with the rental of a dwelling and
10 the on-site rental services provided within the office fall within the FHA statute. In
11 the instant case, the named Plaintiffs both assert that Defendant’s failure to remove
12 communication and architectural barriers to permit access to Defendant’s on-site
13 rental services contained within the office is a separate, independent, actionable
14 violation of this FHA section § 3604(f)(2), even without reference to the ADA as a
15 predicate. Plaintiffs have alleged that Defendants’ Property has overt and obvious
16 physical barriers to access its rental services provided in its on-site office. See ¶¶25 -
17 26. The 9th Circuit *Smith* court stated that the mere observation of overt architectural
18 barriers is actionable. *Smith* at 1104 [“To read an additional standing requirement
19 into the statute beyond mere observation, however, ignores that many overtly
20 discriminatory conditions, for example, lack of a ramped entryway, prohibit a
21 disabled individual from forming the requisite intent or actual interest in renting or
22 buying *for the very reason* that architectural barriers prevent them from viewing the
23 whole property in the first instance” (emphasis in original)]. The *Smith* court found
24 Defendants liable under this FHA subsection even though that case did not involve
25 ADA Title III claims. However, Plaintiffs did not just allege that Plaintiff Club
26 observed Defendant’s overt architectural barriers, but Plaintiffs alleged that a
27 Plaintiff Club member experienced the barriers, that the named Individual Plaintiff
28

1 had actual knowledge of Defendants' communication and architectural barriers and
 2 Plaintiff LEE was deterred from obtaining equal access to Defendant's office facility
 3 and its rental services located therein. Defendants also discriminated against
 4 Plaintiffs by failing to modify its practices and policies to provide access via other
 5 methods of access to its rental services contained within the office on or off the site.
 6 Defendant's failure to remove the architectural and communication barriers to access
 7 its facilities and the rental services located therein, or to provide an accommodation
 8 to provide methods of alternate access to the office facility, providing rental services
 9 constitutes the prohibited discrimination, separately and independently.

10 Additionally, Defendant's conduct is also prohibited under ADA Title III and
 11 constitutes a second, separate, independent source of discrimination against Plaintiffs
 12 in violation of FHA § 3604(f)(2). Since Defendants discriminatory conduct involves
 13 Defendants' rental facilities and its rental services located therein, Plaintiffs assert
 14 any discriminatory conduct found in violation of ADA Title III also constitutes
 15 prohibited "discrimination" under FHA § 3604(f)(2).

16 CLAIM IV: Discrimination In Violation of 42 § 3604(f)(3)(A and B only)

17 31. Plaintiffs do not make any claim against Defendants for a failure to "design
 18 and construct" pursuant to § 3604(f)(3)(C). Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26
 19 above and elsewhere herein this complaint, Plaintiffs suffered discrimination by
 20 Defendants in violation of FHA sections § 3604(f)(3)(A, B) only. The FHA requires
 21 that "...[f]or the purposes of this subsection, discrimination includes-- (B) a refusal
 22 to make reasonable accommodations in rules, policies, practices, or services, when
 23 such accommodations may be necessary to afford such person equal opportunity to
 24 use and enjoy a dwelling..." 42 § 3604(f)(3)(B). See also *Giebler v. M & B*
 25 *Associates*, 343 F.3d 1143 (9th Cir 2003). Defendants improperly refused Plaintiffs'
 26 repeated written and other requests for an accommodation to have equal access to its
 27 rental services.
 28

1 CLAIM V: Discrimination In Violation of 42 § 3604(c) As To NSA

2 32. Based on information, belief, and the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 – 26 above and
 3 elsewhere herein, Plaintiffs herein alleges that Defendants caused Plaintiffs to suffer
 4 the injury of discrimination since Defendants violated 42 U.S.C. §§ 3604 (c) with
 5 respect to its notices, statements, and advertisements (“NSA”). Plaintiffs allege that
 6 Defendants discriminated against them when Defendants made, printed, or
 7 published, or caused to be made printed, or published notices, statements, or
 8 advertisements (“NSA”) that suggest to an ordinary reader a preference to attract
 9 tenants without disabilities. Defendants' Internet advertising regarding its rental
 10 services has an unlawful disparate impact on Plaintiffs.
 11

12 SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION : Violation of California Fair Housing Act

13 33. Failure to Provide Obvious Reasonable Accommodation and Modification:
 14 Based on information, belief and the facts stated above at ¶¶ 8 – 26 above and
 15 elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants refused to make
 16 reasonable accommodations in rules, policies, practices, or services in violation of
 17 CA Government Code sections 12927 and 12955.2, when these accommodations
 18 may be necessary to afford a disabled person equal opportunity to use and enjoy
 19 Defendants’ rental services. As stated in detail above, Defendants refused to make
 20 reasonable accommodations with the instant Plaintiffs and discriminated against each
 21 of them on the basis of disability.
 22

23 THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS- Claims Under
 24 The Americans With Disabilities Act Of 1990

25 34. ADA Standing:

26 ADA Title III does cover public and common use areas at housing
 27
 28

developments when these public areas are, by their nature, open to the general public. An office providing rental services is open to the general public. (See U.S. Department of Justice - ADA Title III Technical Assistance Section III-1.2000, Illustration 3, office on or off the site covered). The parking and paths of travel to the office on or off the site are also covered. See Section III-1.2000, ADA Title III Technical Assistance Manual, <http://www.ada.gov/taman3.html> (“ILLUSTRATION 3: A private residential apartment complex contains a office on or off the site. The office on or off the site is a place of public accommodation”). See *Kalani v Castle Village, LLC*, 14 F.Supp.3d 1359, 1371 (E.D.Cal, 2014)[citing *Johnson v. Laura Dawn Apartments, LLC*, 2012 WL 33040 at *1 n. 1 (E.D.Cal.2012) (Hollows, M.J.) (“[t]he leasing office of an apartment is a place of public accommodation.”]. In the present case, the named Plaintiffs have sufficiently alleged that Defendants have an office at the Property that provides rental services. Following prior sister Circuit Courts of Appeals decisions, our Ninth Circuit Court very recently held that an ADA Plaintiff can be only a “tester” and have standing. See *Civil Rights Education & Enforcement Center v. Hospitality Properties Trust*, 867 F.3d 1093 (9th Cir. 2017) [the Ninth Circuit CREEC court held (1) ADA “tester” standing is valid and a Plaintiff’s motivation for visit is “irrelevant”, and (2) an ADA “deterrent effect doctrine” claim does not require a Plaintiff to have a personal encounter with the barrier to equal access, only to have knowledge of the barrier] citing *Havens Realty Corp. v. Coleman*, 455 U.S. 363, 372–74, 102 S.Ct. 1114 (1982); *Smith v. Pacific Properties and Development Corp*, 358 F.3d 1097, 1102-1104 (9th Cir 2004); *Chapman v. Pier 1 Imports (U.S.) Inc.*, 631 F.3d 939 (9th Cir 2011, en banc); *Houston v. Marod Supermarkets, Inc.*, 733 F.3d 1323, 1335–37 (11th Cir. 2013); *Colo. Cross Disability Coal. v. Abercrombie & Fitch Co.*, 765 F.3d 1205, 1210–11 (10th Cir. 2014). In the present case, the named Plaintiffs each have ADA standing. Plaintiffs have alleged that Defendants discriminated against Plaintiffs in violation of

1 ADA Title III statutes and regulations as detailed further in the ADA claims stated
 2 below. As a result, the named Plaintiffs have each suffered injury and each seek
 3 only injunctive and declaratory relief pursuant to their ADA Claims.

4 CLAIM I: **Auxiliary Aids – Failure To Effectively Communicate**

5 35. 42 United States Code 12182(b)(2)(iii) states, "a failure to take such steps as
 6 may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied
 7 services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of
 8 the absence of auxiliary aids and services, unless the entity can demonstrate that
 9 taking such steps would fundamentally alter the nature of the good, service, facility,
 10 privilege, advantage, or accommodation being offered or would result in an undue
 11 burden;..." Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this
 12 complaint, Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon allege that Defendants
 13 violated said provision. Plaintiffs set forth the factual basis for this claim most
 14 specifically at ¶¶ 13 -14, 16-24 above. The ADA "applies to the services of a place
 15 of public accommodation, not services *in* a place of public accommodation. To limit
 16 the ADA to discrimination in the provision of services occurring on the premises of a
 17 public accommodation would contradict the plain language of the statute." Nat'l
 18 Fed'n of the Blind v. Target Corp., 452 F. Supp. 2d 946, 953 (N.D. Cal. 2006)
 19 (emphasis added) (citing *Weyer v. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp.*, 198 F.3d
 20 1104, 1115 (9th Cir. 2000) [holding that "whatever goods or services the place
 21 provides, it cannot discriminate on the basis of disability in providing enjoyment of
 22 those goods and services"])). An ADA plaintiff may challenge a business' online
 23 offerings as well. So long as there is a "nexus"—that is, "some connection between
 24 the good or service complained of and an actual physical place"—a plaintiff may
 25 challenge the digital offerings of an otherwise physical business. *See Gorecki v.*
 26 *Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 2017 WL 2957736, at *4 (C.D. Cal. June 15, 2017) [Case:
 27
 28

CV 17–1131–JFW (SKx)]. The ADA requires the Defendants to provide effective communication to the instant Plaintiffs and to people with disabilities. In the present case, Plaintiffs experienced and have knowledge that Defendants failed to have a required procedure to provide effective communication. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants failed to train their staff on the way to use the auxiliary aids. Defendants did not provide any auxiliary aid and the Defendants did not provide any reasonable accommodation to the overt and obvious communication barriers, and failed to respond to Plaintiffs’ requests for accommodation. Plaintiffs are not demanding that Defendants provide a specific reasonable accommodation or a specific auxiliary aid. ADA law allows the Defendants to decide what auxiliary aid and reasonable accommodation will be provided. In this case, however, Defendants failed to provide any reasonable accommodation for the overt and obvious communication barriers to equal access to their rental services, failed to provide any auxiliary aid, and failed to provide any effective communication. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants’ websites provide a contact number for the general public, but Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs with the required effective communication using texting or other alternate means of communication for Plaintiffs and other people with a deaf condition or a speech condition. Defendants’ conduct discriminates against Plaintiff Club’s members that have hearing disabilities and Club’s members with speech disabilities. Defendants are required to provide, on Defendants’ websites, to provide a method to effectively communicate with Plaintiff Club members that have hearing and speech disabilities, and other people that are deaf or have speech impairments.

CLAIM II: Denial of Participation

36. 42 United States Code 12182(b)(1)(A)(i) states, "It shall be discriminatory to subject an individual or class of individuals on the basis of a disability or disabilities of such individual or class, directly, or through contractual, licensing, or other

arrangements, to a denial of the opportunity of the individual or class to participate in or benefit from the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of an entity." Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon allege that Defendants violated said provision. Plaintiffs set forth the factual basis for this claim most specifically at ¶¶ 20-24 above. Defendants discriminated against Plaintiffs in violation of 42 United States Code 12182(b)(1)(A)(i) and 42 U.S.C. § 12188.

CLAIM III: Participation in Unequal Benefit

37. Defendants provide unequal benefit for people with disabilities in violation of 42 United States Code 12182(b)(1)(A)(ii) and 42 U.S.C. § 12188. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon allege that Defendants discriminated against Plaintiffs in violation of said provision. Plaintiffs set forth the factual basis for this claim most specifically at ¶¶ 20-24 above.

CLAIM IV: Separate Benefit

38. Defendants' photographs discriminate against Plaintiffs in violation of 42 United States Code 12182(b)(2)(A)(iii) and 42 U.S.C. § 12188. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon allege that Defendants discriminated against Plaintiffs in violation of said provision. Plaintiffs set forth the factual basis for this claim most specifically at ¶¶ 20-24 above.

CLAIM V: Integrated Settings

39. Defendants' rental services are not integrated for Plaintiffs and people with disabilities in violation of 42 United States Code 12182(b)(1)(B) and 42 U.S.C. § 12188. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon allege that Defendants discriminated

1 against Plaintiffs in violation of said provision. Plaintiffs set forth the factual basis
2 for this claim most specifically at ¶¶ 20-24 above.

3 **CLAIM VI: Failure To Modify Practices, Policies And Procedures**

4 40. Defendants failed and refused to provide a reasonable alternative by
5 modifying its practices, policies, and procedures in that they failed to have a scheme,
6 plan, or design to accommodate Plaintiff Club, its Club members, the individual
7 named Plaintiff, and/or others similarly situated in utilizing Defendants' rental
8 services, at its websites and its office at the Property, in violation of 42 United States
9 Code 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii) and 42 U.S.C. § 12188. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26
10 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon
11 allege that Defendants discriminated against Plaintiffs in violation of said provision.
12 Plaintiffs set forth the factual basis for this claim most specifically at ¶¶ 18-26 above.

13 **CLAIM VII: Failure To Remove Architectural And Communication Barriers**

14 41. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants failed to remove architectural barrier and
15 communication barriers as required in violation of 42 United States Code
16 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and 42 U.S.C. § 12182. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26
17 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon
18 allege that Defendants discriminated against the named Individual Plaintiff in
19 violation of said provision. Plaintiffs set forth the factual basis for this claim most
20 specifically at ¶¶ 8,9,20-24,25,26 above. The named Individual Plaintiff personally
21 reviewed all the information and photographs of Defendants' property. As a result,
22 the named Individual Plaintiff has actual knowledge of the physical and
23 communication barriers that exist at Defendants' Property. The named Individual
24 Plaintiff determined that the physical barriers that exist at Defendants' property,
25 directly relate to his disabilities, and make it impossible or extremely difficult for
26 him to physically access Defendants' rental services at the Property. The named
27 Individual Plaintiff was deterred by his actual knowledge of the physical and
28

1 communication barriers that exist at Defendants' Property which include but are not
 2 limited to the barriers to facilities for disabled parking, exterior path of travel to the
 3 office, the office entrance, and office interior, since said Defendants' facilities were
 4 not accessible because they failed to comply with the Federal ADA Accessibility
 5 Guidelines ("ADAAG") and California's Title 24 Building Code Requirements. See
 6 ¶¶ 25 for details. The named Individual Plaintiff had actual knowledge of these
 7 barriers and determined that it would be futile gesture for him to go to the Property
 8 on the date that he had originally intended. The named Individual Plaintiff is
 9 currently deterred from returning due to his knowledge of the barriers. At the end of
 10 this action, the named Individual Plaintiff intends to return to Defendants' physical
 11 office on or off the site location to obtain rental information and verify that the
 12 communication and physical barriers to Defendants' rental services are removed.
 13 Defendants failure to remove the barriers to equal access constitutes discrimination
 14 against the named Individual Plaintiff.

15 **CLAIM VIII: Failure To Make Alterations Readily Accessible And Usable**

16 42. Defendants are required to make alterations to their facilities in such a manner
 17 that, to the maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily
 18 accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals who
 19 use devices pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §12183(a)(2). Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 -
 20 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint, the named Plaintiffs are informed, believe,
 21 and thereon allege that Defendants violated this provision. Plaintiffs allege that
 22 Defendants altered their facility in a manner that affects or could affect the usability
 23 of the facility or a part of the facility after January 26, 1992. In performing the
 24 alteration, Plaintiffs allege tht Defendants failed to make the alteration in such a
 25 manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are
 26 readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals
 27 who use devices, in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12183(a)(2).
 28

1 CLAIM IX: **Administrative Methods**

2 43. Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon allege that Defendants contract
3 with website providers without making sure that the websites will be accessible to
4 people with disabilities in violation of 42 United States Code 12182(b)(1)(B) and 42
5 U.S.C. § 12188. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this
6 complaint, Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon allege that Defendants
7 discriminated against the named Individual Plaintiff in violation of said provision.
8 Plaintiffs set forth the factual basis for this claim most specifically at ¶¶ 18-26 above.

9 CLAIM X: **Screen Out**

10 44. Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon allege that Defendants screened
11 out Plaintiffs and other people with disabilities in violation of 42 United States Code
12 12182(b)(2)(A)(i) and 42 U.S.C. § 12188. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26
13 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon
14 allege that Defendants discriminated against the named Plaintiffs in violation of said
15 provision. Plaintiffs set forth the factual basis for this claim most specifically at ¶¶ 8
16 - 26 above. Defendants screened out the named Plaintiffs from its rental services and
17 processes, because Defendants failed to remove architectural and communication
18 barriers to its website and physical office, failed to provide required effective
19 alternate communication methods, and failed to provide required auxiliary aids.

20 CLAIM XI: **Denial Of Full And Equal Access**

21 45. Defendants are required to provide full and equal access to Defendants' rental
22 services, goods, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations pursuant to 42
23 United States Code 12182(b) and 42 U.S.C. § 12188. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶
24 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and
25 thereon allege that Defendants discriminated against the named Plaintiffs in violation
26 of said provision. Plaintiffs set forth the factual basis for this claim most specifically
27
28

at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above.

CLAIM XII: Failure To Investigate And Maintain Accessible Features

46. Defendants made repairs and administrative changes which violated ADA and its regulations. See ADA Title III Regulations Sec.36.211 Maintenance of accessible features. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Defendants failed to provide and then maintain any accessible features in its parking, path of travel, office on or off the site services and website rental services. Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon allege that Defendants discriminated against the named Plaintiffs in violation of this provision.

CLAIM XIII: Association

47. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon allege that Defendants discriminated against the named Plaintiffs in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(1)(E)

DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES IN PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

**FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION: ONLY THE INDIVIDUALL NAMED
PLAINTIFF AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS - CLAIMS UNDER CALIFORNIA
ACCESSIBILITY LAWS**

CLAIM I: Denial Of Full And Equal Access

48. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint, the named Individual Plaintiff was denied full and equal access to Defendants' goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations within a public accommodation owned, leased, and/or operated by Defendants as required by Civil Code Sections 54, 54.1, and specifically 54.1(d). The factual basis for this claim is at 18-28 above.

1 CLAIM II: **Failure To Modify Practices, Policies And Procedures**

2 49. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint,
3 the named Individual Plaintiff was denied full and equal access to Defendants' goods.
4 Defendants failed and refused to provide a reasonable alternative by modifying its
5 practices, policies, and procedures in that they failed to have a scheme, plan, or
6 design to assist Plaintiff Members and/or others similarly situated in entering and
7 utilizing Defendants' services as required by Civil Code § 54.1. The factual basis for
8 this claim is at 18-28 above.

9 CLAIM III: **Violation Of The Unruh Act**

10 50. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint,
11 the individual, the named Individual Plaintiff was denied full and equal access to
12 Defendants' goods. Defendants violated the CA Civil Code § 51 by specifically
13 failing to comply with Civil Code §51(f). Defendants' facility violated state
14 disability laws, the ANSI Standards, A117, and California's Title 24 Accessible
15 Building Code by failing to provide equal access to Defendants' facilities.
16 Defendants did and continue to discriminate against Plaintiff Members in violation
17 of Civil Code §§ 51(f), and 52. The factual basis for this claim is at 18-28 above.

18 **Treble Damages Pursuant To California Accessibility Laws**

19 51. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint,
20 only the named Individual Plaintiff prays for an award of treble damages against
21 Defendants, and each of them, pursuant to California Civil Code sections 52(a) and
22 54.3(a). Defendants, each of them respectively, at times prior to and including the
23 day the named Individual Plaintiff attempted patronized Defendants' facilities and
24 rental services, and continuing to the present time, knew that persons with physical
25 disabilities were denied their rights of equal access. Despite such knowledge,
26 Defendants, and each of them, failed and refused to take steps to comply with the
27 applicable access statutes; and despite knowledge of the resulting problems and
28

denial of civil rights thereby suffered by the named Individual Plaintiff. Defendants, and each of them, have failed and refused to take action to grant full and equal access to the individual Plaintiff in the respects complained of hereinabove. Defendants, and each of them, have carried out a course of conduct of refusing to respond to, or correct complaints about, denial of disabled access and have refused to comply with their legal obligations to make Defendants' public accommodation facilities and rental services accessible pursuant to the ADAAG and Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (also known as the California Building Code). Such actions and continuing course of conduct by Defendants in conscious disregard of the rights and/or safety of the named Individual Plaintiff justify an award of treble damages pursuant to sections 52(a) and 54.3(a) of the California Civil Code.

DEMAND FOR JUDGMENT FOR RELIEF:

A. All named Plaintiffs seeks injunctive relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3613(c) and 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a). Only the named Individual Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief pursuant to CA Civil Code §52. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3613(c), all Plaintiffs request this court to enjoin Defendants to cease their discriminatory practices in housing rental services, rental housing management services, and for Defendants to implement written policies and methods to respond to reasonable accommodation and reasonable modification requests. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a), Plaintiffs request this Court enjoin Defendants to remove all barriers to equal access to the disabled Plaintiffs in, at, or on their facilities, including but not limited to architectural and communicative barriers in the provision of Defendants' rental services. Plaintiffs do not seek injunctive relief pursuant to Cal. Civil Code §55 and Plaintiffs do not seek attorneys' fees pursuant to Cal. Civil Code §55. Plaintiffs do not seek any relief at all pursuant to Cal. Civil Code §55.

B. All named Plaintiffs seek actual damages pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3613(c).

1 However, Plaintiff Club only seeks damages for itself. Plaintiff Club does not seek
2 damages on behalf of its members;

3 C. Only the named Individual Plaintiff seeks recovery of actual damages pursuant
4 to Cal. Civil Code §§ 52 or 54.3;

5 D. Only the named Individual Plaintiff seeks \$4,000 in minimum statutory
6 damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code § 52 for each and every offense of Civil Code §
7 51, pursuant to Munson v. Del Taco, (June 2009) *46 Cal. 4th 661*;

8 E. In the alternative to the damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code § 52 in Paragraph
9 C above, only the named individual Plaintiff seeks \$1,000 in minimum statutory
10 damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code § 54.3 for each and every offense of Civil Code
11 § 54.1;

12 F. All named Plaintiffs seek attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3613(c)(2), 42
13 U.S.C. § 12205, and Cal. Civil Code §§ 52, 54.3;

14 G. Only the named individual Plaintiff seeks treble damages pursuant to Cal.
15 Civil Code §§ 52(a) or 54.3(a);

16 H. The named Plaintiffs are seeking perspective injunctive relief to require the
17 Defendants to provide obvious reasonable accommodations, to provide the required
18 auxiliary aids and to modify Defendants' procedures, practices, and policies of the
19 Defendants in the provision of Defendants' rental services. Without perspective
20 relief the Plaintiffs will suffer future harm.

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

- 1 I. All named Plaintiffs seek a Jury Trial and;
2 J. For such other further relief as the court deems proper.

3
4 Respectfully submitted:

5 LIGHTNING LAW, APC

6 Dated: July 31, 2022

7 By: /s/David C. Wakefield
8 DAVID C. WAKEFIELD, ESQ.
9 Attorney for Plaintiffs
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28